APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,295	05/17/2005	Zsolt Saffer	AT 020070	5859

24737   7590   10/06/2008
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
GODBOLD, DOUGLAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/535,295	SAFFER, ZSOLT
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DOUGLAS C. GODBOLD	2626	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 September 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is FINAL.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>17 September 2008</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to correspondence filed September 17, 2008 in

reference to application 10/535,295. Claims 1-11 are pending and have been

examined.

Response to Amendment

2.   The amendments to the drawings filed September 17, 2008 have been accepted

and considered in this office action. The objections to the drawings have been

withdrawn.

3.   Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last

Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

6.   Claims 1, 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Brookes et al (US PAP 2004/0059575) in view of Martino et al. (US Patent 6,061,646).

7.   Consider claim 1, Brookes teaches a speech recognition device for recognizing

text information corresponding to speech information, (figure 2a-2c), which speech

information can be characterized in respect of language properties (context paragraph

0053), wherein first language-property recognition means are provided that, by using

the speech information, are arranged to recognize a first language property and to

generate first property information representing the first language property that is

recognized (paragraph 0053, recognizer makes a first pass to determined context

information), and wherein speech recognition means are provided that are arranged to

recognize the text information corresponding to the speech information by continuously

taking into account at least the first property information (paragraph 0053-0054, context

is used to determine grammar for 2nd pass recognition), wherein the first language

property characterizes context of the speech information (context, paragraph 0053.).

        Brookes does not specifically teach second language-property recognition means

are provided that, by using the speech information, are arranged to recognize a second

language property of the speech information and to generate second property

information representing the second language property that is recognized; the second

language property is selected from the group consisting of speech segmentation,

language information, and speaker group; wherein speech recognition means are

provided that are arranged to recognize the text information corresponding to the

speech information by continuously taking into account at least the first property
information and the second property information.

In the same field of speech recognition, Martino teaches second language-
property recognition means are provided that, by using the speech information, are
arranged to recognize a second language property of the speech information and to
generate second property information representing the second language property that is
recognized (figure 4, language is recognized; column 10 line 58-65); the second
language property is selected from the group consisting of speech segmentation,
language information, and speaker group (language is a language property).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time
of the invention to combine the language detection of Martino with the recognition
system of Brookes in order to allow for accurate transcriptions in more than one
language using limited processor and memory resources (Martino column 1 line 61 –
column 2 line 5.). This combination now suggests that the speech recognition means
are provided that are arranged to recognize the text information corresponding to the
speech information by continuously taking into account at least the second property
information (In the obvious combination, the recognition means of Brookes would be
executed following language detection and language dictionary selection of Martino in
order for the unit to function).

8.   Consider claim 3, Brookes and Martino suggest a speech recognition device as
claimed in claim 1, wherein the speech recognition means are arranged to recognize

the text information with a delay of at least a time-span that is required by the at least

two language-property recognition means for the generation of the at least two items of

property information, during which time-span a part of the speech information is used by

the at least two language-property recognition means to generate the at least two items

of property information, which text information corresponding at least to a sub-area of

that part of the speech information used to generate the at least two fed items of

property information (Brookes teaches in figure 4b, that the recognition of context, then

next recognition step are performed successively. Therefore delays are inherent to hold

the data while each step is performed. When combined with Martino, it is inherent that

the data must be delayed for the language determination step to be performed.).

9.   Consider claim 4, Brookes and Martino suggest a speech recognition device as

claimed in claim 1, wherein at least one item of property information generated with the

help of language-property recognition means can be fed to other language-property

recognition means and wherein the other language-property recognition means are

arranged to take into account the at least one item of property information that is fed to

them when recognizing the language property of the speech information and when

generating the property information (Figure 4B of Brookes shows that the steps are

performed in succession. Therefore when Martino is combined with Brookes, this step

would be performed in succession as well, as Martino would limit the contexts available

to Brookes to one language).

10.   Consider claim 5, Brookes and Martino suggest a speech recognition device as

claimed in claim 4, wherein the other language-property recognition means are

arranged to recognize the language property with a delay of at least a time-span that is

required for the generation of the at least one item of property information that is fed to

them, during which time-span a part of the speech information is used by the language-

property recognition means to generate the at least one item of property information that

is fed to them, said language property characterizes at least a sub-area of that part of

the speech information that is used to generate the at least one fed item of property

information (Brookes teaches in figure 4b, that the recognition of context, then next

recognition step are performed successively. Therefore delays are inherent to hold the

data while each step is performed. When combined with Martino, it is inherent that the

data must be delayed for the language determination step to be performed.).

11.   Claim 6 is a method (Brookes figure 3) requiring similar limitations to those of

claim 1 and is therefore rejected for similar reasons.

12.   Claim 8 is a method requiring similar limitations to those of claim 3 and is

therefore rejected for similar reasons.

13.   Claim 9 is a method requiring similar limitations to those of claim 4 and is

therefore rejected for similar reasons.

14.   Claim 10 is a method requiring similar limitations to those of claim 5 and is

therefore rejected for similar reasons.

15.   Claim 11 is a computer readable medium (which is taught paragraph 0010 of

Brookes.) including code requiring similar limitations to those of claims 1 and 6, and is

therefore rejected for similar reasons.

16.   Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Brookes in view of Martino as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of

Lee et al. (US PAP 2002/0087306).

17.   Consider claim 2, Brookes and Martino teach a speech recognition device as

claimed in claim 1, but does not specifically teach receiving means are provided that are

arranged to receive the speech information via at least two recognizable reception

channels, wherein reception-channel recognition means are provided that are arranged

to recognize the reception channel being used at the time to receive the speech

information and to generate channel information representing the reception channel

recognized, and wherein at least one of the at least two language-property recognition

means and/or the speech recognition means are/is arranged to take into account the

channel information.

         In the same field of speech recognition, Lee teaches receiving means are

provided that are arranged to receive the speech information via at least two

recognizable reception channels (paragraph 0011, multi-port board 36 accepts multiple phone calls.), wherein reception-channel recognition means are provided that are arranged to recognize the reception channel being used at the time to receive the speech information and to generate channel information representing the reception channel recognized (noise domain unit 38 detects background noises and takes into account for model detection, paragraph 0012, 0013), and wherein at least one of the at least two language-property recognition means and/or the speech recognition means are/is arranged to take into account the channel information (paragraph 0014, speech models are adjusted for speech recognition in accordance with noise detection results).

       Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the noise compensation and multi-channel input of Lee with the system of Brookes and Martino in order to allow the recognition system of function in noisy environments (paragraph 0004) and to allow multiple users to access the recognition.

18.   Claim 7 is a method requiring similar limitations to those of claim 2 and is therefore rejected for similar reasons.

Conclusion

19.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS C. GODBOLD whose telephone number is (571)270-1451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:00am-4:30pm Friday 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DCG
/Patrick N. Edouard/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626